

have sufficient supplies for our army. Tibet, however, has become very useful to us as a spring-board for our attack on India. Because Tibet is a strategic country, we are going to guard the Indo-Tibetan border securely. Thereafter, the conquest of India is an easy affair."

Can the Communists make good their boast? Much of this answer can be given only by wise and positive actions of the free nations of the world, both individually and in concert. Yet, an immediate answer can and should be given by individual men and women motivated both by humanitarian compassion and by a recognition of kinship with the Tibetan people in their struggle to survive.

Help and encouragement can be and is being given to the more than 80,000 Tibetan refugees in India and the border states who are courageously striving both to build new lives for themselves and at the same time to preserve their religion, their culture, and their national entity.

The Tibetans, with their deep faith, still believe the struggle is not hopeless, that eventually the tragic events in their homeland will come to an end. Our faith may not equal theirs. But at least we can extend our friendship, our assistance, and our encouragement—so they may persevere.

A Passing American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1967

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, from the liberal extremists we hear the frequent shouts and see the demonstrations protesting anything which they can possibly construe to be a denial of their right to dissent.

They are also the first, through word and action, to deny that same right to the other side. Any patriotic utterance or writing brings immediate villification and smear.

George Todt, long time columnist for the Los Angeles Herald Examiner and other papers, knows from personal experience how they work. George stands up for traditional Americanism and has known the heavy hand of intolerance.

The subjects of his February 16, 1967, column, patriot Dr. John Lechner, recently deceased, and 1964 presidential nominee, Barry Goldwater, also learned what it means to be patriotic. George Todt's column follows:

A PASSING AMERICAN

(By George Todt)

"I think we should let the military have a crack at this war in Vietnam. The children have had their say long enough." (Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C., Feb. 11, 1967.)

The body of a great American patriot, Dr. John Lechner, has just been laid to rest in the Southland. This is a time of grief and tribulation for his fellow conservatives. He loved God and country. He was my friend.

He was often downgraded and berated by Communists, left-wingers and their ill-assorted coterie of multitudinous assistants. They heartily disliked his sterling defense of the traditional American heritage and our cherished free enterprise system.

But to right-thinking people everywhere who knew his very real dedication and devo-

tion to the fundamental principles which made our nation rise to the top of the pile, he was a truly great citizen.

LINE GETS THIN

Following the deaths of such eminent Southern California freedom fighters as Walt Disney, Russell Quisenberry and D. B. Lewis, all in the past year, the loss of "Dr. John" Lechner comes as a heavy blow to us now.

The thin red-white-and-blue line is growing much too thin.

Can it be revived and resuscitated before Fabian socialism becomes the order of the day in America? What will the answer be?

What has happened to the "right to dissent"—for conservatives?

"Dr. John" and his hard-working Americanism Educational League were the first to have Sen. Barry Goldwater on the podium here after he was defeated in the 1964 presidential campaign. He was proud of him.

Goldwater did not lose then because of his ideology, which was superior—much of his Vietnam policy was afterwards adopted by LBJ, for example—but simply because 8 million GOP liberals were turncoats.

LEFT WING MIFFED

The Republican left wing was miffed because Barry did not provide the ticket with a liberal runningmate. They walked out in a bad display of temper that was childish and disastrous for the GOP. It cost the election.

Rep. William Miller of New York, the Republican National Chairman, was a man of superior American ideology to Governors Nelson, Rockefeller, William Scranton or George Romney at that time. He deserved the nomination.

However, one learns from experience. I preferred Miller to any of the challengers for second spot in 1964 then. But in the light of what happened, I now think it would have been the best course otherwise.

If Goldwater had picked Scranton, Rockefeller or Romney to assist him in second spot—and any one of them would have been eager to do so, contrary to propaganda—he could have won by 1 million votes.

LBJ won by 16 million, but the entire difference was accounted for by the defecting GOP liberal wing, which went over en toto.

Had this 8 million GOP liberals been added to the 27 million votes Goldwater obtained, he would have had 35 million votes. Conversely, if the same amount had been subtracted from the LBJ total, he would have subsequently totalled 34 millions.

ASSUMPTION GOES ASTRAY

Let nobody fool you into thinking the ideology of Goldwater was incorrect. It was not. His only fault lay in not winning the election—and this was caused by his failure to "balance" the ticket.

I plead guilty to the same error, myself. This column backed Miller for second place because he was the best man, in this writer's opinion. My main mistake—and undoubtedly Barry's too—was in assuming that in the last analysis the GOP liberals would not be disloyal, disappear.

CIA's Extracurricular Activities Indicate Funding Reductions Necessary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 1967

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, it has become obvious during the current public debate and discussion over

the conduct and operation of the Central Intelligence Agency that the CIA has been profligate and wasteful in the expenditure of funds and has strayed far afield from its basic role of protecting the national interest and national security.

As we all know now, the CIA has indulged in such extracurricular activities as subsidizing educational organizations, labor groups, churches, and foundations, among others.

The fact that the CIA has deemed it advisable to spread its wings so wide indicates that this agency is overbudgeted and overfunded and is experiencing difficulty in expending funds allocated to it.

In other words, the CIA has too much money with too little control and, therefore, has branched out into these diverse areas where any relationship to our national security is certainly remote. It is my feeling that funds for the CIA should be sharply reduced in order that it may zero in on its real mission—its basic role of intelligence.

In this connection, the Washington Post recently published an article by Mr. John Kenneth Galbraith, an economist and perceptive observer and a former high Government official in Washington, who concludes that "the CIA was doing some things that were frightful nonsense."

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in the activities of the CIA, I ask unanimous consent that this article be reprinted in the Appendix of the Record.

The article follows:

CIA NEEDS A TUG ON ITS PURSE STRINGS—A MAN WHO HAS HAD SOME DEALINGS WITH THE AGENCY SAYS IT LACKS THE DISCIPLINE OF PENURY

(By John Kenneth Galbraith)

(Harvard economist Galbraith was an adviser to President John F. Kennedy and has been Ambassador to India.)

The public discussion of a secret agency, even one with such an excellent instinct for headlines as the CIA, is likely to suffer a little from a shortage of information. Few things in my life have concerned me less than the intelligence activities and associated skulduggery of the United States Government. They require an anonymity for which I have no obvious talent. But it happens that for one brief period, I was deeply involved.

Without revealing any secrets, none of which, it should be added, would be of more than momentary interest, or joining the ravening wolves which in Washington pounce on any individual or agency which has problems, I would like to add a little material to the discussion.

My experience was during the Kennedy Administration and especially during the early months. I found when I got into matters in my area of interest that the CIA was doing some things that were frightful nonsense. Their possible value ranged from negative to negligible; the consequences, if properly publicized, would be horrifying.

I set out to bring them to an end. One or two of the bogus liberals who had been washed into Washington with the new Administration warned me that I was making a bad mistake. (One of them, I have now discovered, had been heading an organization financed by the CIA.)

Backed by the President, helped by the soul-searching that followed the Bay of Pigs fiasco and also by some very sensible people within the agency itself, I was successful. Later I had to fight off one or two more richly misconceived adventures, but in general, my troubles were at an end. I learned